

REMARKS

Claims 7 and 8 are presented for consideration, with Claim 7 being independent.

Claim 7 has been amended to further distinguish Applicants' invention from the cited art. Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, in Figures 2 and 11, and the accompanying text in the specification. In addition, Claim 8 has been added to provide an additional scope of protection. Claims 1 and 3-6 have been cancelled.

Claims 1 and 3-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious over Omai '283 in view of Hardt '901, Matsumoto '190 and Hiroki '253. This rejection as it applies to Claims 1 and 3-6 is deemed to be moot in view of the cancellation of these claims. This rejection as applied to Claim 7 is traversed.

Claim 7 of Applicants' invention relates to a projection display apparatus comprised of a display panel having a rectangular substrate with four sides, a circuit board provided with a drive circuit for driving the display panel, and a projection lens support provided with a projection lens for projecting an enlarged image onto a screen. As amended, the four sides of the display panel include first and second pairs of opposite sides and a plurality of electrodes disposed along only the first pair of opposite sides. Also provided is a holder for holding the display panel and provided with positioning means for positioning the holder and the projection lens support, wherein the projection lens support is positionally aligned and connected with the display panel via the holder by the positioning means. As further amended, Claim 7 sets forth that the display panel, the projection lens support and the circuit board are integrally fixed by fixing screws, and the plurality of electrodes and circuit board are electrically connected by the fixing screws.

In this manner, an efficient and effective projection display apparatus can be provided.

The primary citation to Omae relates to a polymer dispersion liquid crystal panel for use in a television. The television includes a light source 171, a projection lens 174 and a screen 176, as shown in Figure 21. The Office Action acknowledges that Omae does not teach a projection holder fixed on the circuit board for holding the display panel and positioning means for positioning the holder and projection lens support or electrodes that are electrically connected by way of a connector.

The secondary citation to Hardt relates to an LED indicating light assembly and was cited to compensate for the deficiency in Omae relating to the projection holder fixed on the circuit board and having positioning means for positioning the holder and the projection lens support. Hardt shows, in Figure 2, a socket structure 100 that mechanically holds a conventional LED device 46a and molded plastic lens members 48a, 48b.

Matsumoto relates to a liquid crystal display device and was cited for its teaching of a connector 4 for connecting electrodes of a display panel and electrodes of a circuit board. In Figure 2, Matsumoto shows the connector 4 to be supported on a circuit board 5 and having a conductive contact 4a for contacting a signal input electrode 1a of a liquid crystal panel 1.

Finally, Hiroki relates to a picture display device and was cited for its teaching of shift registers.

Initially, Applicants respectfully maintain their position that it would not have been obvious to combine Omae, Hardt and Matsumoto in the manner suggested in the Office Action for the reasons set forth in the previous Amendment of February 20, 2003. Nevertheless,

it is submitted that such a combination, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest several features of Applicants' claimed invention. For example, the proposed combination of art does not teach or suggest a plurality of electrodes disposed along only one pair of opposite sides on the display panel, or fixing the display panel, the projection lens support and the circuit board by fixing screws, with the plurality of electrodes and the circuit board electrically connected by the fixing screws. In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that socket cavities 128 and 130 in Hardt are not "functionally equivalent" to Applicants' claimed positioning means, as they do not position a holder and a projection lens support. Furthermore, the signal input electrode 1a in Matsumoto does not provide electrodes that are positioned and electrically connected in the manner set forth in Applicants' Claim 7.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claim 7 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claim 8 sets forth additional features of Applicants' invention relating to shift registers, and independent consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Due consideration and prompt passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott D. Malpede
Attorneys for Applicants
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM:eyw

DC-MAIN 173582 v1